

REMARKS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of August 4, 2006.

The spelling of words in the various claims noted in numbered paragraph 1 of the Office Action has been corrected, thereby obviating this objection.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Rodriguez reference (U.S. published patent application 2002/0138341) in view of the Tappler reference (U.S. published patent application 2006/0080536).

The Rodriguez reference discloses a method for verifying identification of voters and a system that protects the voting data by encrypting the flowing data in the network. However, with the Rodriguez system, people who count the votes can easily alter the vote count because the voting data is stored in the database such as an SQL Server. The engineer with knowledge of the SQL server technology can operate the SQL Server directly to easily delete or falsify the original voting data.

Similarly, with the Rodriguez system, engineers are able to check the voting progress by hitting a simple computer command, such as "Candidate A has 90 votes and Candidate B has 300 votes so far", while the polls are open and voting is occurring. If an engineer gives that information to a person who was going to vote for Candidate A, the person may not vote for Candidate A.

On the other hand, the Tappler reference endeavors to make the voting data reliable by using time-stamping by adjusting the time on the voter's computer to the standard time. The Tappler reference does not have the concept of a "voting period" or a "voting counting period". As Tappler reads in paragraph [0429] that "The eVote, itself constituting a digital data file, is susceptible to time-base data manipulation by trusted insiders", this system is designed under

assumption that the insider/engineer is trustworthy. Also, as described in the paragraph that “In another vulnerability, the eVote itself can be false,.....but report and record the false outcome for actual election result computing purposes”, a false outcome by a malfeasant insider cannot be eliminated during the voting period but is going to be inspected after the election.

This is quite different from the presently claimed invention which, in Claim 1 recites “said output start time occurs after said input end time” followed by:

information receiving means for receiving said entry information elements transmitted from said terminal, said information receiving means is operative to receive said entry information elements transmitted from said terminal during said input operation period starting from said input start time kept by said time keeping means until said input end time kept by said time keeping means;

information encrypting means for encrypting said entry information elements received from said information receiving means;

information storing means for storing said encrypted entry information elements produced by said information encrypting means; and

information decrypting means for decrypting said encrypted entry information elements stored in said information storing means during said output operation period.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is believed to be in immediate

condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and pass this application to early issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald E. Brown", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

212.297.5800
Pitney Hardin LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036-7311